

Investigate The State Dept.

JUST HOW RESPONSIBLE IS THE STATE DEPARTMENT?

HEADS STATE DEPT

Senator Thomas H. Kuchel
Senate Office Building
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Senator:

There is a strong proclivity among communists, socialists, collectivists and New Frontiersmen, who are systematically destroying the traditional American way of life and planning to replace it with a one-world socialist government, to classify as "extreme" and "irresponsible" those Americans who intend to prevent this incredible treachery and protect American sovereignty, independence and freedom.

The enclosed copy of COMMON SENSE for August 1962, contains a brief but terribly revealing summary of the pattern in which our State Department, under all recent administrations and under the control of the Establishment and Council on Foreign Relations, has aided our Communist enemies, harassed, insulted and repudiated our friends and allies, protected and promoted communism and socialism all over the world, interfered criminally in the affairs of other nations, and has downgraded and all but destroyed our national sovereignty and our prestige. The list is not complete.

Ironically, the same issue of COMMON Sense carries a letter by Assistant Secretary of State, Frederick Dutton to Senator Hartke which hurls the familiar charge of "irresponsibility" at the paper. As a subscriber to the periodical, I have never found it irresponsible or, in fact, anything but factual, revealing and informative about critical events which do not reach me through the insidiously controlled American press. I have nothing but commendation and respect for its patriotic publisher who has the courage, the initiative and the ability to expose the internal enemies of this country. I support his statement that millions of people believe the State Department is irresponsible. I am one of them and have no associates who think otherwise.

Considering the charge of irresponsibility and its source, just how responsible is the State Department which has the insolence to impugn the reliability of real Americans because they dare to speak the truth?



Secretary of State, Dean Rusk

1. How responsible is an agency of the government which proposes to surrender our arms and military strength—our entire means of national defense—to a Communist inspired, Communist originated, and Communist dominated international agency in which the United States will continue to be outvoted, outmaneuvered and outwitted by its sworn enemies and their allies and dupes? Is this irresponsibility in the most fantastic sense of the word? Or is it also treason, treachery and utter madness?

2. How irresponsible is an agency which, while asking Congress for a 100 million dollar "loan" to the United Nations to pay for its crimes against Katanga, secretly gives 212 million of the taxpayers' dollars to that Communist-dominated instrument where it is quietly distributed to our enemies and the "neutrals" to reduce their delinquent assessments so they may continue in good standing to vote against our policies? Is that merely irresponsible, or is it also treasonous dishonest and deceitful?

3. How responsible is a government which promotes, supports and finances the infamous UN atrocities against the Katangans under the name of "peace-keeping"? Was that just irresponsibility, or was it the most despicable and savage violation of Christian principles and civilized human precepts ever perpetrated by American "leaders"?

4. How responsible is a government which initiates an invasion against Communist Cuba and then scuttles all chances of success by withdrawing vital support at the critical time, so that the courageous nationals who were depending upon the integrity of the United States could be slaughtered or captured like sitting ducks? What brand of responsibility was that fiasco? And what is the word for the current gutless indecision about Cuba?

Mr. Senator, the list of conspiratorial actions emanating from Washington is a long and growing one. The foregoing are simply recent and shameful examples. The obvious indictments against the State Department and those who control it are incredibly grave, and the ultimate consequence of your allowing that situation to continue will be fatal to our country and to every concept of decency, freedom and sovereignty for which it has stood since it was founded by wiser and braver men of the past.

I urge that you initiate and support to the fullest extent of your influence a thorough investigation of the State Department and those alien forces which appear to control its policies. I urge that a searching examination be made of the relationship between the State Department and the Council on Foreign Relations to fix the responsibility for our disastrous foreign policy.

Mr. Senator, it is approaching High Noon in the crescendo of conspiracy against this country and the history of its freedom. I believe that you, as a representative of the people, owe it to your God, your country, your family and yourself to take immediate and forceful action to expose and demolish the insidious treachery which is leading rapidly, now, to the destruction of this country and the civilized world. Congress is our last hope. If you fail, the world fails with you. I hope that you will accept the challenge.

Very truly yours,
Murray C. Beebe, Jr.

cc All Senators, Representatives, members of the State Department, the President, Mr. Conde McGinley, Mr. Frederick Dutton.

EUROPE LAUNCHES AN S.O.S. TO AMERICA

Republished from—

Economic Council Letter No. 533

Merwin K. Hart, President

National Economic Council, Inc.

156 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.

* * * * *

From Our European Correspondent

Paris, July 25, 1962

The stage has been set for a socialist take-over in Western Europe, a take-over that could run like clockwork and within a matter of months confront us with the nucleus of a one-world, socialist government. British Labor's obstinacy has given us a breathing spell. American Labor's determination and the American public's apathy may quite likely be the West's undoing in the end. The conditioning has been going on for months. We are hearing less and less about stopping communism, nothing about rolling it back. The new jingo is "peaceful social revolution." Kennedy recently echoed it in Mexico, Harland Cleveland in Europe, and Mennen Williams in Africa.

It is that vague term, "peaceful social revolution," that America should bear in mind; for Europe's Common Market, which started out as an excellent thing, is grad-

ually, behind our backs and as we are being pushed towards it, being given a new complexion. Behind the fine-sounding label of "an economic United Nations," the Common Market, with Britain and us in it, is slated to become international free enterprise's slaughtering pen. Recent developments will furnish an idea how far the program has gone.

George Meany corralled European labor leaders in Paris the last week in June to put the finishing touches to another of those innumerable "holding companies" for labor operation in the international political field that come in for no public scrutiny. This time it was the JOINT TRADE UNION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (JTUAC), formed to "advise"—lay down the law to, in laymen's English—the ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT (OECD). Mr. Meany told the boys that 25% of AFL-CIO's income goes for "overseas work," a euphemism for labor-socialism's political fight, in European countries. What right Mr. Meany or American labor has to reach out of the domain of American labor and meddle in world affairs is something a rudely awakened public is someday going to have to ask.

Meany's immediate objective abroad has never been concealed. He and Reuther want to establish wage scales identical with America's, in all industries, in all countries. To do so on United Nations level is out of

the question for the moment. The field is too big, the voracious little nations too poor. A European Common Market, dominated by and including Britain and America, offers the better solution. It is quicker, easier, and enough key Western nations would be in it to carry the rest by their own weight.

There are nuances to the reasons for desiring an international labor gang-up that would impose American wage levels all over Western Europe. For Meany and Reuther, it would force American industries that have fled abroad back into their clutches. They could never pay American wages in small countries with limited markets and exist.

For European labor leaders the game is purely political. And the plan is infallible. Upping wage scales to American standards would set prices soaring and industries crumbling. It would ruin their countries economically, but the accompanying upheaval would carry the labor leaders into power. And since they would count on remaining in power forever, any price it costs the nation is not too high.

Britain stalled the plot, by a hair's breadth, at the big international labor congress in West Berlin, the first week of July. Here is what happened.

George Woodcock, of Britain's TRADE UNION CONGRESS (TUC), faced a solid phalanx of European unions, regimented and paid by AFL-CIO, but nominally commanded by Belgium's Walter Schevenels in the